

REMARKS

Applicants have reviewed the Final Office Action dated April 2, 2009, and the references cited therein. Claims 1, 6-9, 11, 12, and 19-23 were previously pending. Claims 11, 12 and 20-23 stand rejected as obvious over Sawyer US App. Pub. 2004/0052037 (Sawyer) in view of Hack et al. US App. Pub. 2002/0030647 (Hack). Claims 20 and 21 stand rejected as obvious over Sawyer in view of Radley-Smith US Pat. No. 7,209,114 (Radley-Smith). Applicants note with appreciation the allowance of claims 1, 6-9 and 19.

Applicants have amended independent claim 22 in response to the Office Action's obviousness rejection in order to more particularly distinguish the claimed invention from the flexible display device disclosed in Sawyer (as modified by Hack). Applicants have canceled claims 20 and 21. Applicants have also re-introduced previously canceled claims 13-16 as new dependent claims 24-27 (depending from claim 22).

Applicants request favorable reconsideration of the Office Action's grounds for rejecting claims 11, 12, 22 and 23, in view of Applicants' amendments and the remarks provided herein. Please charge any fee deficiencies to Deposit Account No. 12-1216.

The Rejection of Claims 11, 12, 22 and 23 As Obvious Over Sawyer in View of Hack

Applicants, in view of the present amendments based upon the disclosed embodiment depicted in FIGs. 8-10, traverse the previous rejection of claim 22 over Sawyer in view of Hack. Applicants have amended independent claim 22 (from which claims 11, 12 and 23 depend) to distinguish the claimed invention from the combined teachings of Sawyer and Hack. In particular, Applicants have distinguished their claimed "protection foil" (e.g., protection foil 80 in FIG. 8) from Sawyer's disclosure, at FIG. 4, and paragraph [0032], by reciting that the claimed protection foil is:

mechanically coupled to roll and unroll with the flexible display,

positioned against the flexible display in the rolled-up state, and

unconnected over a surface area to the flexible display, thereby allowing separate movement of the protection foil and the flexible display when not in the rolled-up state.

This feature is neither disclosed nor suggested in Sawyer (see, FIG. 4, par. [0032] showing the corresponding structure being bonded over its area to the flexible display) or Hack.

Conclusion

Applicants respectfully submit that the patent application is in condition for allowance. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of the subject application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,



Mark Joy, Reg. No. 35,562
LEYDIG, VOIT & MAYER, LTD.
Two Prudential Plaza, Suite 4900
180 North Stetson Avenue
Chicago, Illinois 60601-6731
(312) 616-5600 (telephone)
(312) 616-5700 (facsimile)

Date: September 2, 2009